



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/039,118

01/04/2002

Shannon Jones

005306.P006

1044

7590

06/20/2006

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

R. Alan Burnett  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
Seventh Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/039,118

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Huyen X. Vo

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/4/2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Regarding claims 1-11 and 15-20, applicant argues to traverse prior art rejection based on an amended limitation regarding *"enabling the user to access a domain of the enterprise system after logging into the enterprise data system, each domain corresponding to a particular object or type of data; enabling the user to request an ad hoc query be performed against data stored by the accessed domain using a spoken natural language query and enabling the user to navigate in the accessed domain using spoken navigation"* (page 13 of the REMARKS section). However, Bennett et al. teach a speech recognition system that enables users to perform searches on database using voice queries (*the operation of figure 1*). Bennett et al. fail to specifically teach a logging process. However, Uppaluru teaches this process (*see reference*).
3. Regarding claims 28-29, applicant argues to traverse prior art rejection based on an amended limitation regarding *"if the pre-compiled data corresponding to the data request is stored in the local database, retrieving data from the local database corresponding to the ad hoc query; and if pre-compiled data corresponding to the data request is not stored in the local database, retrieving data from the enterprise data system corresponding to the ad hoc query"* (last paragraph on page 14 and first

paragraph on page 15 of the REMARK section). However, it is not clear if the precompiled data is generated before runtime or at runtime. Examiner treats precompiled data is generated at runtime.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (US Patent No. 6633846).

6. Regarding claim 28, Bennett et al. disclose a method for accessing an enterprise data system via telephone using a voice access system, comprising: defining a set of grammars comprising a language and syntax in which data are stored as phonetic representations of the data (*col. 12, lines 1-17*); retrieving selected data from the enterprise data system (*col. 25, lines 19-35*); pre-compiling at least a portion of the selected data into predefined forms corresponding to the set of grammars (*col. 25, lines 19-35*); storing the pre-compiled data in a local database that is apart from the enterprise data system (*col. 25, lines 19-35*); enabling a user to request an ad hoc query be performed against data stored in the enterprise data system and/or local

database using a spoken natural language query (*Speech Input in figure 1, query input by the user is an ad hoc query because it specifies what the system should look for*); converting the spoken natural language query into a data request (*elements 182-184 in figure 1*); if the pre-compiled data corresponding to the data request is stored in the local database, retrieving data from the local database corresponding to the ad hoc query; and if pre-compiled data corresponding to the data request is not stored in the local database (*col. 24, line 56 to col. 25, line 12, compiling at runtime*), retrieving data from the enterprise data system corresponding to the ad hoc query (*elements 182-184 in figure 1 and/or col. 24, line 56 to col. 25, line 12*); and providing feedback data corresponding to data that are retrieved in a verbal format to the user via the telephone connection (*col. 25, line 62 to col. 26, line 3 and figure 11C*).

7. Regarding claim 29, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 28, wherein header data that are used to identify objects are stored in the local database while detail data corresponding to the objects are stored in the enterprise database (*col. 25, lines 19-35*).

8. Regarding claim 30, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 28, further comprising: defining a set of objects for which data are to be pre-compiled (*col. 25, lines 19-47*); defining a schedule identifying when data corresponding to the set of objects are to be pre-compiled (*col. 25, lines 19-47*); and pre-compiling data corresponding to those objects based on the schedule (*col. 25, lines 19-47*).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-11 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. (US 6633846) in view of Uppaluru (US 5915001).

11. Regarding claims 1, 3 and 15-16, Bennett et al. disclose a method for accessing data from an enterprise data system via user voice input: enabling a user to establish a communications connection to a voice access system (*the operation of figure 1*); enabling the user to request an ad hoc query be performed against data stored by the accessed domain using a spoken natural language query (*Speech Input in figure 1, query input by the user is an ad hoc query because it specifies what the system should look for*) and enabling the user to navigate in the accessed domain using spoken navigation (*col. 37, line 29 to col. 38, line 43, using spoken commands to access/navigate information on web pages*); converting the spoken natural language query into a data query and executing the data query to retrieve any data in the accessed domain corresponding to the ad hoc query (*elements 182-184 in figure 1 and/or col. 24, line 56 to col. 25, line 12*); and providing feedback data corresponding to

data retrieved from the accessed domain in a verbal format to the user (*col. 25, line 62 to col. 26, line 3 and figure 11C*).

Bennett et al. fail to specifically disclose the step of authenticating a user using a login process in which the user is identified by a unique voice user identifier; and transparently logging the user into the enterprise data system through use of information obtained during authentication of the user, and enabling the user to access a domain of the enterprise system after logging into the enterprise data system, each domain corresponding to a particular object or type of data. However, Uppaluru teaches the step of authenticating the user using a login process in which the user is identified by a unique voice user identifier (*col. 3, line 1-17, including PIN numbers entered using keypad or verbal*); and transparently logging the user into the enterprise data system through use of information obtained during authentication of the user (*col. 3, line 1-17*), and enabling the user to access a domain of the enterprise system after logging into the enterprise data system, each domain corresponding to a particular object or type of data (*col. 3, line 1-17, including PIN numbers entered using keypad or verbal to log into the system*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to prevent unauthorized user from gaining access to services and to ensure security.

12. Regarding claim 2, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the data query includes reference to a unique enterprise data system user identifier such that the ad hoc query returns user-specific data (*col. 25, line 62 to col. 26, line 3 and/or referring to figure 11C*).

13. Regarding claims 4 and 17, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, further comprising: converting the spoken natural language query into a data request in an application-readable form (*col. 24, line 56 to col. 25, line 12*); identifying one or more objects and data criteria corresponding the spoken natural language query by processing the data request (*col. 25, lines 1-12*); and formulating the data query based on any objects and data criteria that are identified (*col. 25, lines 1-12*).

14. Regarding claims 5 and 18, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 4, wherein the enterprise data system includes an object manager and data manager that are used to enable access to data stored in an enterprise database, further comprising: passing information corresponding to any objects and data criteria that are identified to the object manager (*col. 25, lines 1-61 and/or referring to figures 11A-B*); formulating a database query based on the objects and data criteria passed to the object manager in consideration of enterprise database schema information available to the data manager (*col. 25, lines 1-61 and/or referring to figures 11A-B*); submitting the database query to the enterprise database (*col. 25, lines 1-61 and/or referring to figures 11A-B*); receiving a result set back from the enterprise database in response to the database query (*col.*



25, lines 62 to col. 26, line 3 and/or referring figure 11C); and processing the result set to produce the feedback data (col. 25, lines 19-61).

15. Regarding claim 6, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 5, further comprising: extracting object data from the result set (col. 25, lines 19-35), but fail to specifically disclose the steps of defining a prompt and slotted data string corresponding to a grammatical form in which data are to be presented to a user; embedding the object data into slots in the prompt and slotted data string to produce the feedback data. However, Uppaluru further teaches the steps of defining a prompt and slotted data string corresponding to a grammatical form in which data are to be presented to a user (col. 19, line 45 to col. 20, line 34); embedding the object data into slots in the prompt and slotted data string to produce the feedback data (col. 19, line 45 col. 20, line 34).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to ease subscriber's access by automatically filling in the needed fields and guiding the user to input command step by step.

16. Regarding claim 7, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein converting the spoken natural language query into the data query comprises: receiving user voice input as digital waveform data (*Input Speech in figure 1*); passing the digital waveform data to a voice recognition component (*SRE 155 and 182 in figure 1*);

receiving application-readable data from the voice recognition component corresponding to the spoken natural language query (*col. 25, lines 1-12*); and processing the application-readable data to determine what data the user desires to retrieve (*col. 25, lines 1-47*).

17. Regarding claim 8, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 2, further comprising: defining a grammar syntax language comprising a plurality of grammars specifying grammatical formatting of legal user inputs (*col. 19, lines 27-67 and col. 27, lines 20-67*); and determining what the user desires to retrieve by processing user voice input in consideration of the grammar syntax language (*col. 19, lines 27-67*).

18. Regarding claim 9, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein providing feedback data corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system in a verbal format to the user comprises: defining a text string corresponding to a grammatical form in which data are to be presented to a user (*speech output in figure 1*); embedding data retrieved from the enterprise data system to form an embedded data text string (*col. 25, line 62 to col. 26, line 3*); passing the embedded data text string to a text-to-speech conversion component (*TTS 159 in figure 1*); receiving digital waveform data from the text-to-speech conversion component corresponding to the embedded data text string (*Speech Output in element 158 in figure 1*); streaming the digital waveform data to a device that produces an audible sound in response to processing the digital waveform data to produce a verbalized feedback to the user

*(Speech Output in element 158 in figure 1, audio unit is inherently included to produce the audible sound).*

Bennett et al. fail to disclose the step of embedding data retrieved from the enterprise data system in slots defined in the text and slotted data string to form an embedded data text string. However, Uppaluru further teaches the step of embedding data retrieved from the enterprise data system in slots defined in the text and slotted data string to form an embedded data text string (*col. 19, line 45 to col. 20, line 34*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to ease subscriber's access by automatically filling in the needed fields and guiding the user to input command step by step.

19. Regarding claim 10, Bennett et al. fail to disclose the method of claim 9, wherein a plurality of text and slotted data strings are defined, each corresponding to a respective system response, further comprising: determining a current navigation context of the user; and selecting an appropriate text and slotted data string from among said plurality of text/prompt and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on the current navigation context of the user. However, Uppaluru further teach the steps of determining a current navigation context of the user (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*); and selecting an appropriate text/prompt and slotted data string from among said

plurality of text and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on the current navigation context of the user (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to ease the subscriber's access.

20. Regarding claim 11, Bennett et al. fail to disclose the method of claim 9, wherein a plurality of text and slotted data strings are defined, each corresponding to a respective system response, further comprising: identifying attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system; and selecting an appropriate text/prompt and slotted data string from among said plurality of text and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on any attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system that are identified.

However, Uppaluru further teach the steps of identifying attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*); and selecting an appropriate text/prompt and slotted data string from among said plurality of text and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on any attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system that are identified (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2626

the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to ease the subscriber's access.

21. Regarding claim 19, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 18, wherein use of the object manager and data manager abstracts objects from how data corresponding to the objects are stored in the enterprise database such that a schema of the enterprise database may be changed without requiring any changes to any voice access system component that is external to the enterprise data system (*Database 188, the database is simply a piece of memory, where data are entered/updated frequently ready to be accessed by the subscriber. The database is inherently independent of other processing units. Therefore, changing the contents of the database will not affect other processing units*).

22. Regarding claim 20, Bennett et al. fail to disclose the method of claim 15, further comprising: retrieving data pertaining to a selected object for the user from the enterprise data system through use of the unique user identifier upon login to the voice access system; and providing feedback data corresponding to any data that are retrieved in a verbal format to the user via the communications connection. However, Uppaluru further teach the steps of retrieving data pertaining to a selected object for the user from the enterprise data system through use of the unique user identifier upon login to the voice access system (*col. 19, lines 24-32*); and providing feedback data

corresponding to any data that are retrieved in a verbal format to the user via the communications connection (*col. 19, lines 24-32*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to assist user in using the service.

23. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. (US Patent No. 6633846) in view of Uppaluru (US Patent No. 5915001), and further in view of Denneberg et al. (US Patent No. 6724864).

24. Regarding claim 12, Bennett et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein providing feedback data corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system in a verbal format to the user comprises: passing data retrieved from the enterprise data system to a text-to-speech conversion component (*TTS 159 in figure 1*); receiving text-to-speech (TTS) digital waveform data from the text-to-speech conversion component corresponding to the data passed to it (*output of the TTS 159 in figure 1*); an audible sound in response to processing the digital waveform data to produce a verbalized feedback to the user (*output of the TTS 159 in figure 1*).

Bennett et al. fail to specifically disclose the steps of storing a plurality of prompt audio files, each comprising prompt digital waveform data that when processed produces a verbalized prompt comprising one or more words; defining a prompt

identifier and slotted data string specifying a grammatical form in which data are to be presented to a user by identifying prompt audio files to be streamed and defining in order specifying where data are to be inserted relative to any prompts audio files that are identified; streaming prompt and TTS digital waveform data to a device that produces; wherein portions of the prompt and TTS digital waveform data are streamed, in order, based on an ordered defined by the prompt identifier and slotted data string, and prompt digital waveform data is retrieved from prompt audio files corresponding to the prompt identifiers.

However, Denneberg et al. teach the steps of storing a plurality of prompt audio files, each comprising prompt digital waveform data that when processed produces a verbalized prompt comprising one or more words (*col. 4, line 26 to col. 5, line 33*); defining a prompt identifier and slotted data string specifying a grammatical form in which data are to be presented to a user by identifying prompt audio files to be streamed and defining in order specifying where data are to be inserted relative to any prompts audio files that are identified (*col. 13, lines 5-25*); streaming prompt and TTS digital waveform data to a device that produces (*col. 4, line 26 to col. 5, line 33*); wherein portions of the prompt and TTS digital waveform data are streamed, in order, based on an ordered defined by the prompt identifier and slotted data string, and prompt digital waveform data is retrieved from prompt audio files corresponding to the prompt identifiers (*col. 4, line 26 to col. 5, line 33*).

Since the modified Bennett et al. and Denneberg et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Denneberg et al. in order to make it easy for the user to follow instructions.

25. Regarding claim 13, Bennett et al. fail to disclose the method of claim 12, wherein a plurality of text and slotted data strings are defined, each corresponding to a respective system response, further comprising: determining a current navigation context of the user; and selecting an appropriate text and slotted data string from among said plurality of text/prompt and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on the current navigation context of the user. However, Uppaluru further teach the steps of determining a current navigation context of the user (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*); and selecting an appropriate text/prompt and slotted data string from among said plurality of text and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on the current navigation context of the user (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to ease the subscriber's access.

26. Regarding claim 14, Bennett et al. fail to disclose the method of claim 12, wherein a plurality of text and slotted data strings are defined, each corresponding to a respective system response, further comprising: identifying attributes corresponding to



data retrieved from the enterprise data system; and selecting an appropriate text/prompt and slotted data string from among said plurality of text and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on any attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system that are identified.

However, Uppaluru further teach the steps of identifying attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*); and selecting an appropriate text/prompt and slotted data string from among said plurality of text and slotted data strings based, at least in part, on any attributes corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system that are identified (*col. 18, line 45 to col. 19, line 60*).

Since Bennett et al. and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Bennett et al. by incorporating the teaching of Uppaluru in order to ease the subscriber's access.

27. Claims 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru (US 5915001) in view of Bennett et al. (US 6633846).

28. Regarding claim 21, Uppaluru discloses a method for accessing an enterprise data system via a telephone, comprising: enabling a user to establish a telephone connection to a voice access system (*the operation of figure 1*); authenticating the user with the voice access system using a login process in which the user is identified by a

unique user identifier (*col. 3, line 1-17, including PIN numbers entered using keypad or verbal*); determining enterprise data system log-in data that enables the user to access the enterprise data system, based on the unique user identifier for the voice access system (*col. 3, line 1-17*); automatically logging the user into the enterprise data system using the enterprise data system log-in data (*col. 3, line 1-17*); providing a voice user interface that enables the user to access a plurality of domains and navigate from an accessed domains using spoken navigation (*element 105 in figure 1*), wherein each domain comprises data corresponding to a respective type of object in the enterprise data system (*the personal voice web section in col. 11-15*); and providing feedback data in a verbal format to the user via the telephone connection in response to spoken navigation (*col. 19, line 24-60*).

Uppaluru fails to specifically disclose providing a voice user interface query data from a plurality of domains using natural language query commands, and providing feedback data corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system in response to the natural language query commands. However, Bennett et al. teaches providing a voice user interface that enables the user query data from a plurality of domains using natural language query commands (*element 105 in figure 1*), and providing feedback data corresponding to data retrieved from the enterprise data system in response to the natural language query commands (*col. 19, line 24-60*).

Since Uppaluru and Bennett et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Uppaluru by incorporating the teaching of Bennett

et al. in order to enable the user to navigate and query the system using voice command and natural language query to retrieve data of interest.

29. Regarding claims 22-23, Uppaluru further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the voice user interface includes a set of global voice commands that enables the user to jump from a current domain to a new domain (*col. 8, lines 32-51, "next" and "previous" commands and/or col. 17, lines 37-57*), and wherein the voice user interface includes voice commands that are context sensitive to a current navigation context of the user, such that the user may navigate to another navigation context from a current navigation context using navigation voice commands that are based, at least in part, on the current navigation context of the user (*col. 17, lines 37-57*).

30. Regarding claim 24, Uppaluru further discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising: generating a data query to retrieve data from the enterprise data system, said data query returning a plurality of data sets pertaining to an object to which the ad hoc query corresponds to (*col. 19, lines 56-60, "results"*); and enabling the user to browse the plurality of data sets using verbal input (*col. 19, lines 32-45, "navigate appropriate hyper links"*).

31. Regarding claim 25, Uppaluru further disclose the method of claim 21, further comprising: maintaining navigation tracking information for the user that identifies navigation locations the user has previously navigated to (*col. 8, lines 32-51, the "next"*

*command and/or col. 19, lines 1-60*); and selecting system prompts based on the navigation tracking information for the user such that the user is presented with a different system prompt if the user has not previously navigated to a current navigation location than the user is presented with if the user has previously navigated to the current navigation location (*col. 19, lines 1-60*).

32. Regarding claim 26, Uppaluru further disclose the method of claim 21, wherein the ad hoc query comprises a request to retrieve data corresponding to a domain the user is currently in that is provided to the enterprise data system and returns a plurality of data sets comprising header data identifying items pertaining to the current domain, further comprising: enabling the user to browse the header data on an item-by-item basis using verbal navigation commands (*col. 19, lines 32-45*); and reading the header data corresponding to each item in response to a user navigation to that item (*col. 19, lines 46-60*).

33. Regarding claim 27, Uppaluru further discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising: enabling the user to request detail information corresponding to an item that is currently being browsed (*col. 29, lines 24-60*); retrieving detail information from the enterprise database corresponding to the item currently being browsed (*col. 29, lines 24-60*); and reading the detail information to the user via the telephone connection (*col. 29, lines 24-60*).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV

6/13/2006

\*\*\*

  
RICHMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER